APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/725,386	11/29/2000	Erin M. Bourke-Dunphy	MS160274.1	6575

27195   7590   07/31/2003

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER
1900 EAST NINTH STREET
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER
ROCHE, TRENTON J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2124	

DATE MAILED: 07/31/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

Office Action Summary		Application No.		Applicant(s)	
		09/725,386		BOURKE-DUNPHY ET AL.	
		Examiner		Art Unit	
		Trent J Roche		2124	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 November 2000</u> .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on <u>29 November 2000</u> is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>2-4</u> .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-24 have been examined.

Drawings

2.   The drawings are objected to because in Fig. 3 COMPUTERGROUP object 102 is shown

as having MISCDATA property 112, which according to the specification should be

MISCDATA property 104. Furthermore, Group1 object 106 is shown as having MISCDATA

property 104, which according to the specification should be MISCDATA 112. A proposed

drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid

abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

3.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 9, line 10,

reference is made to group objects 110, 112. Group object 112 does not exist in Figure 3 of the

drawings. It is assumed to be corrected as "group objects 108, 110"

        Appropriate correction is required.

4.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 13, line 28,

the phrase "it shown" should read "it is shown".

        Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
> subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6.   Claims 1-11 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

7.   Claim 1 recites the limitation "the plurality of components". There is insufficient

antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Is it assumed for examination purposes to read

"a plurality of components".

8.   Claims 2-11 are rejected for the reason set forth in connection with claim 1 above.

9.   Claim 21 recites the limitation "the information". There is insufficient antecedent basis

for this limitation in the claim. It is assumed for examination purposes to read "information".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed
> in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for
> patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an
> international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this
> subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United
> States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11.   Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,473,771 to Zimniewicz et al.

        The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon

the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C.

102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37

CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the

inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate

showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Regarding claim 1:

Zimniewicz et al teach:

- planning installation of a plurality of application or service components ("the Setup

  Manager sends install message to all components/sub components." In col. 11 lines 5-6)

- an interface component (Note Fig. 9)

- for entering desired system configuration information ("From this view the user may

  select or deselect a component and set its installation directory of any component." in col.

  13 lines 11-13)

- providing an installation procedure based on dependency requirements for the plurality of

  components("the order required by inter-dependencies between the components." in col.

  11 lines 8-9)

Regarding claim 2:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Zemniewicz et al disclose the ability to

identify selected components to be installed, as was noted in the rejection of claim 1.

Regarding claim 3:

The rejection of claim 2 is incorporated, and further, Zemniewicz et al disclose a dependency

engine which checks for proper dependencies ("Then, the Dependency Manager is called…to

perform dependency checking among the components that user has selected." in col. 11, lines
52-54)

Regarding claim 5:

The rejection of claim 2 is incorporated, and further, Zemniewicz et al disclose an identified
order for installing the selected components ("provides dependency checking and install order
calculation and verification across all selected components..." in col. 9 lines 2-4)

Regarding claim 6:

The rejection of claim 5 is incorporated, and further, Zemniewicz et al disclose a plurality of
computers ("to one or more remote computers" in col. 5 lines 20-21)

Regarding claim 12:

Zimniewicz et al teach:

- planning installation of a plurality of application or service components ("the Setup
  Manager sends install message to all components/sub components." in col. 11 lines 5-6.

- selecting components to be installed ("From this view the user may select or deselect a
  component and set its installation directory of any component." in col. 13 lines 11-13)

- determining an installation procedure based on dependency requirements for the selected
  components ("the order required by inter-dependencies between the components." in col.
  11 lines 8-9)

Regarding claim 13:

The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated, and further, the limitation regarding ensuring proper dependency between selected components would be rejected for the reasons set forth in connection with claim 3.

Regarding claim 15:

The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated, and further, the limitation regarding an order for installing the selected components would be rejected for the reasons set forth in connection with claim 5.

Regarding claim 16:

The rejection of claim 15 is incorporated, and further, the limitation regarding identifying a plurality of computers would be rejected for the reasons set forth in connection with claim 6.

Regarding claim 22:

The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated, and further, Zimniewicz et al disclose printing the installation procedure ("During the install stage the UI Manager displays the Installation Progress page. During each of the three install stages, the description text…is updated to reflect which stage of install is occurring." in col. 10 lines 59-62)

Regarding claim 23:

The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated, and further, Zimniewicz et al disclose a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions ("A computer-readable medium having stored thereon an application program..." in col. 14 lines 46-47)

Regarding claim 24:

Zimniewicz et al teach:

- a data packet adapted to be transmitted between at least two processes ("In a networked environment, program modules...may be stored in the remote memory storage device" in col. 5 lines 39-42)

- an interface component for entering desired system configuration information ("From this view the user may select or deselect a component and set its installation directory of any component." in col. 13 lines 11-13)

- providing an installation procedure based on dependency requirements for a plurality of application or service components ("the order required by inter-dependencies between the components." in col. 11 lines 8-9)

12.   Claim 1 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,442,754 to Curtis.

Regarding claim 1:

Curtis teaches:

- a system for planning installation of a plurality of application or service components ("a

    system...for installing a program onto a computer..." in col. 3 lines 53-55)

- an interface component for entering desired system configuration information ("another

    GUI panel...queries a user for the location of where to install the program." in col. 6 lines

    45-47)

- providing an installation procedure based on dependency requirements for the plurality of

    components (Note Fig. 4a and the corresponding section of the disclosure)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

14.   Claims 4 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent

6,473,771 to Zimniewicz et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,487,713 to Cohen et al.

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon

the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C.

102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37

CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the

inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of

invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter

disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference

under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the

application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in

the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in

accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this

rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the

claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or

subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and §

706.02(l)(2).

Regarding claim 4, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated, and further, Zemniewicz et al do not

teach the dependency engine adding each necessary component to ensure proper dependency.

Cohen et al disclose a configurator, when encountering a dependency that depends upon the

presence of an object, automatically selects that object for inclusion in col. 112 lines 2-5. It

would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to program the dependency engine to automatically include a needed object, as this would

allow the installation to continue with no user intervention.

Regarding claim 14, the rejection of claim 13 is incorporated, and further, the limitation

regarding the dependency engine adding each necessary component to ensure proper dependency

would be obvious in view of Cohen et al for the reasons set forth in connection with claim 4.

15.   Claims 7-8 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over U.S.

Patent 6,473,771 to Zimniewicz et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,442,754 to Curtis.

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon

the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C.

102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37

CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the

inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of

invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter

disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference

under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the

application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in

the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in

accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this

rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the

claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or

subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and §

706.02(l)(2).

Regarding claim 7, the rejection of claim 6 is incorporated, and further, Zimniewicz et al do not

disclose a file generating component programmed to generate a file identifying a relationship

between the components. Curtis teaches that during installation, each one of the install objects is

written out to a log file, in col. 6 lines 65-66. Because this log file is used for un-installation

purposes, the log file must identify a relationship between the computer and the components

there were installed. It would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to include a log file identifying the relationship between components in the system of Zimniewicz et al, as this would enable the user to easily un-install the components.

Regarding claim 8, the rejection of claim 7 is incorporated, and further, Zimniewicz et al do not disclose writing a file to a predetermined data location. Curtis discloses in col. 6 lines 65-67, a process of writing a log file which is put into a particular directory. It would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place the file in the system disclosed by Zimniewicz and modified by Curtis' teaching into a predetermined location, as this would enable any sort of un-installation program to easily locate the relationship file without the need for user intervention.

Regarding claim 17, the rejection of claim 16 is incorporated, and further, the limitation regarding the generation of a file which defines a relationship between components would be obvious in view of Curtis for the reasons set forth in connection with claim 7.

Regarding claim 18, the rejection of claim 17 is incorporated, and further, the limitation regarding writing a file to a predetermined data location would be obvious in view of Curtis for the reasons set forth in connection with claim 8.

16.   Claims 9-11 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over U.S.

Patent 6,473,771 to Zimniewicz et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,442,754 to Curtis, and further in

view of U.S. Patent 6,119,122 to Bunnell.

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon

the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C.

102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37

CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the

inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of

invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter

disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference

under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the

application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in

the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in

accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this

rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the

claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or

subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and §

706.02(l)(2).

Regarding claim 9, the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated, and further, neither Zimniewicz et al

nor Curtis disclose a data location comprising an object of a distributed directory. Bunnell

teaches in an analogous system for file management in a distributed system similar to the

network disclosed by Curtis in col. 5 lines 37-39, the ability to create and modify data stored on a distributed directory. It would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a distributed directory with the system of Zimniewicz, as this would enable a network administrator to easily track and access data objects across a network using a directory service management program.

Regarding claim 10, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further, neither Zimniewicz et al nor Curtis disclose a group object and a computer object as claimed. Bunnell discloses an object administration interface for a distributed network, consisting of a grouping object with one or more sub-objects. Note Fig. 5 and the corresponding section in the disclosure in col. 10 lines 35-67 and col. 11 lines 1-23. It would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the distributed directory object organization scheme of Bunnell in the invention of Zimniewicz et al, as this would allow a systems administrator to cleanly and efficiently track computer systems and related sub-processes on a network.

Regarding claim 11, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further, Zimniewicz et al do not disclose including a setup engine which accesses an object to automate a portion of an installed process. Curtis teaches the use of Response files to control installation, as stated in col. 9 lines 59-62. It would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a object for automated installation as this would allow a user to initiate the setup program and not need to enter any further information, freeing the user to perform alternate tasks.

Regarding claim 19, the rejection of claim 18 is incorporated, and further, the limitation regarding the object of a distributed directory would be obvious in view of Bunnell for the reasons set forth in connection with claim 9.

Regarding claim 20, the rejection of claim 19 is incorporated, and further, the limitation regarding the group object for characterizing a virtual group of computers, the group object including at least one computer object for identifying member components of the virtual group, the computer object including at least one component object for characterizing the components selected to be installed would be obvious in view of Bunnell for the reasons set forth in connection with claim 10.

Regarding claim 21, the rejection of claim 19 is incorporated, and further, the limitation regarding selecting a component for installation would be obvious in view of Bunnell for the reasons set forth in connection with claim 11.

17.   Claims 2-4, 12-14 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,442,754 to Curtis in view of U.S. Patent 6,487,713 to Cohen et al.

Regarding claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Curtis does not teach identifying selected components to be installed. Cohen et al disclose in an analogous system the ability to add or remove components and features with a mouse, as stated in col. 5 lines 2-3. It

would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to utilize the selection technique of Cohen et al in the installation program of Curtis, as this

would give the user greater flexibility in deciding what they want to install.

Regarding claim 3, the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated, and further, Curtis discloses a

dependency engine programmed to ensure proper dependency between components ("Then, the

Dependency Manager is called…to perform dependency checking among the components that

user has selected." in col. 11, lines 52-54)

Regarding claim 4, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated, and further, Curtis does not teach

the dependency engine adding each necessary component to ensure proper dependency. Cohen et

al disclose a configurator, when encountering a dependency that depends upon the presence of an

object, automatically selects that object for inclusion in col. 112 lines 2-5. It would have been

obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to program the

dependency engine to automatically include a needed object, as this would allow the installation

to continue with no user intervention.

Regarding claim 12:

Curtis teaches:

-   planning installation of a plurality of application or system components ("a system…for

    installing a program onto a computer…" in col. 3 lines 53-55)

- determining an installation procedure based on dependency requirements (Note Fig. 4a and the corresponding section of the disclosure)

Curtis does not teach the selection of components to be installed. Cohen et al disclose in an analogous system the ability to add or remove components and features with a mouse, as stated in col. 5 lines 2-3. It would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the selection technique of Cohen et al in the installation program of Curtis, as this would give the user greater flexibility in deciding what they want to install.

Regarding claim 13, the rejection of claim 12 is incorporated, and further, the limitation regarding ensuring proper dependency between selected components is rejected for the reasons set forth in connection with claim 3.

Regarding claim 14, the rejection of claim 13 is incorporated, and further, the limitation regarding the addition of each necessary component to ensure proper dependency would be obvious in view of Cohen et al for the reasons set forth in connection with claim 4.

Regarding claim 23, the rejection of claim 12 is incorporated, and further, Curtis teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions ("wherein the computer usable media includes at least one computer program..." in col. 17 lines 61-62)

18.   Claims 5-8, 15-18 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

U.S. Patent 6,442,754 to Curtis et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,487,713 to Cohen et al and further

in view of U.S. Patent 5,761,380 to Lewis et al.

Regarding claim 5, the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated, and further, neither Curtis nor

Cohen et al disclose an order for installing the selected components. Lewis et al disclose in an

analogous system for component installation a necessity for an order of installation in col. 5 lines

8-11. It would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have an order of installation of the components, as this would enable components

that may be reliant on others to perform properly.

Regarding claim 6, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated, and further, neither Curtis nor

Cohen et al disclose a plurality of computers. Lewis et al disclose a plurality of computers

("across a plurality of computer systems..." in col. 1 line 63) It would have been obvious to

someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the installation

system of Curtis modified by Cohen et al with a plurality of computers, as this would allow the

administrator to modify installations on a network wide basis to account for the available

resources in the computer network.

Regarding claim 7, the rejection of claim 6 is incorporated, and further, Curtis teaches that

during installation, each one of the install objects is written out to a log file, in col. 6 lines 65-66.

Because this log file is used for un-installation purposes, the log file must identify a relationship

between the computer and the components there were installed.

Regarding claim 8, the rejection of claim 7 is incorporated, and further, Curtis teaches the

writing of a file to a predetermined data location ("written to a log file...which is put into a

particular directory." in col. 6 lines 66-67)

Regarding claim 15:

The rejection of claim 12 is incorporated, and further, the limitation regarding an order for

installing the selected components would be obvious in view of Lewis et al for the reasons set

forth in connection with claim 5.

Regarding claim 16:

The rejection of claim 15 is incorporated, and further, the limitation regarding identifying a

plurality of computers would be obvious in view of Lewis et al for the reasons set forth in

connection with claim 6.

Regarding claim 17, the rejection of claim 16 is incorporated, and further, Curtis teaches the

limitation regarding the generation of a file which defines a relationship between components

which would be rejected for the reasons set forth in connection with claim 7.

Regarding claim 18, the rejection of claim 17 is incorporated, and further, Curtis teaches the

limitation regarding writing a file to a predetermined data location which would be rejected for

the reasons set forth in connection with claim 8.

Regarding claim 22, the rejection of claim 12 is incorporated, and further, neither Curtis nor

Cohen et al disclose printing the installation procedure. Lewis et al disclose, in an analogous

system for installing software components, printing the installation procedure ("The installation

plan is presented on a local system display." in col. 2 lines 18-19) It would have been obvious to

someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to print the installation

information so that the user may easily see what changes are being made to the computer.

19.   Claims 9-11 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

U.S. Patent 6,442,754 to Curtis et al in view of U.S. Patent 6,487,713 to Cohen et al, further in

view of U.S. Patent 5,761,380 to Lewis et al, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,119,122 to

Bunnell.

Regarding claim 9, the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated, and further, neither Curtis nor

Cohen et al nor Lewis et al disclose data location comprising an object of a distributed directory.

Bunnell teaches in col. 5 lines 37-39 the ability to create and modify data stored on a distributed

directory. It would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to use a distributed directory with the system of Curtis, modified by Cohen

et al and further modified by Lewis et al, as this would enable a network administrator to easily

track and access data objects across a network using a directory service management program.

Regarding claim 10, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further, neither Curtis nor

Cohen et al nor Lewis set al disclose a group object and a computer object as claimed. Bunnell

discloses an object administration interface for a distributed network, consisting of a grouping

object with one or more sub-objects. Note Fig. 5 and the corresponding section in the disclosure

in col. 10 lines 35-67 and col. 11 lines 1-23. It would have been obvious to someone of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the distributed directory object

organization scheme of Bunnell in the invention of Curtis, modified by Cohen et al and further

modified by Lewis et al, as this would allow a systems administrator to cleanly and efficiently

track computer systems and related sub-processes on a network.

Regarding claim 11, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further, Curtis teaches the

automation of at least a portion of an associated installation process ("pass a response file to the

install program…including information used to control the installation." in col. 9 lines 60-62)

Regarding claim 19, the rejection of claim 18 is incorporated, and further, the limitation

regarding the object of a distributed directory would be obvious in view of Bunnell for the

reasons set forth in connection with claim 9.

Regarding claim 20, the rejection of claim 19 is incorporated, and further, the limitation

regarding the group object for characterizing a virtual group of computers, the group object

including at least one computer object for identifying member components of the virtual group,

the computer object including at least one component object for characterizing the components

selected to be installed would be obvious in view of Bunnell for the reasons set forth in

connection with claim 10.

Regarding claim 21, the rejection of claim 19 is incorporated, and further, the limitation

regarding selecting a component for installation would be obvious in view of Bunnell for the

reasons set forth in connection with claim 11.

20.   Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent

6,442,754 to Curtis in view of U.S. Patent 6,158,001 to Lee et al.

Regarding claim 24:

Curtis teaches,

-   an interface component for entering desired system configuration information ("another

    GUI panel...queries a user for the location of where to install the program." in col. 6 lines

    45-47)

-   providing an installation procedure based on dependency requirements for the plurality of

    components (Note Fig. 4a and the corresponding section of the disclosure)

Curtis does not disclose a data packet adapted to be transmitted between at least two processes.

Lee et al disclose an analogous system for determining dependencies between entities wherein

data packets are used on a network, as seen in col. 3 lines 27-28. It would have been obvious to

someone of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to develop the installation

system of Curtis with the networking and data packet aspects of Lee et al, as this would allow a

network administrator to send individual install applications over a network to the various

computers, saving the need to copy the install application from a storage device such as a CD-

ROM or floppy disk.

Conclusion

21.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

22.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Trent J Roche whose telephone number is (703)305-4627. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (703)305-9662. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)746-7239 for regular

communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

TJR
July 28, 2003

KAKALI CHAKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100